

EIS001420

# Comment on the Department of Energy's Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement

RECEIVED

FEB 11 2000

I agree with the following statements which I have checked:



- 1 ☒ The No Action Alternatives are not reasonable. The EIS should have a reasonable no action alternative.
- 2 ☒ The EIS is inadequate because it uses outdated 1990 census data rather than current population data for Nevada.
- 3 ☒ The analysis of transportation impacts in Nevada is insufficient for making modal, corridor and route decisions.
- 4 ☒ The floodplain analysis is insufficient for corridor and route selection
- 5 ☒ The impact of stigma on tourism, recreation and agriculture based economies in Nevada should be analyzed.
- ☐ The EIS should analyze the impacts of a crash between a military airplane and a nuclear waste rail car.
- 6 ☒ Other The EIS does not adequately address emergency responses, and related matters such as training, to transportation accidents.

## Comments:

The Department of Energy's Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement describes the impacts of constructing and operating a repository, including transporting nuclear waste by legal weight truck, rail, or rail to heavy haul truck. DOE is required to consider all comments submitted regarding the impacts of building and operating a repository including transportation.

My comments for the record are:

- 7 The selection of Yucca Mountain as the nuclear waste repository has seemed a foregone conclusion since the Nuclear Waste Policy Act was amended. What, if anything, such as the result of studies on seismic activity or the movement of ground water, would disqualify Yucca Mountain as DOE's recommended site?
- 8 The transportation of nuclear waste is my major concern. DOE should not rely on the inadequate information in this Draft EIS for making decision on the critical transportation issue.

Margaret Thedt